

June 3, 1965

12069

"And they came hoping—even if they doubted and distrusted and damned—they came hoping still that this dusty, cluttered, crumbling place would somehow house the dream of a free and noble press to serve all the quarreling, struggling, hoping people of a wondrous land.

"And sometimes, when wisdom paused a moment in its flight and strength arose in time to meet the challenge—the mighty hope and honored dream for a glorious moment at least came true.

"The cobwebs sway for the last time for all we know. The battered floor will creak no more, perhaps, to hurrying footsteps. The whispering breeze carrying tales of times long gone will rustle then unheard.

"But in the proud new building the memories will linger. Much that is old and appears decrepit is much too precious to ever leave behind.—B.J."

"BIG BROTHER"—INVASIONS OF PRIVACY

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today's "Big Brother" item is a letter from Dr. Hans F. Winterkorn, professor of civil engineering at Princeton University.

Professor Winterkorn's letter speaks for itself, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCE,
Princeton, N.J., April 15, 1965.

HON. EDWARD V. LONG,
Senator from Missouri,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: It was indeed a pleasure to meet you and Mrs. Long the other day on the occasion of the crowning of Princess Ann at the dinner of the Missouri State Society.

The purpose of this letter is to express to you my personal thanks for your courageous investigation of the tampering in post offices with first-class mail of American citizens. This tampering has been going on for quite a long time also at the Princeton Post Office. My personal mail was often steamed opened and the flaps reglued so carelessly that the stamps actually were lost in the process and the letters arrived finally without stamps. This I think is a good indication that the opening must have occurred right in our own post office here.

If I could be of help to your committee, I should be glad to testify on my experience with the post office in Princeton.

Sincerely yours,

DR. HANS F. WINTERKORN,
Professor of Civil Engineering.

SALUTE TO TUNISIA ON THE CELEBRATION OF HER INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, with our Nation's anniversary of independence approaching rapidly, the United States is being reminded almost weekly of great strides taken around the globe, during the postwar era, toward the establishment of self-governing nations dedicated to concepts of liberty and to respect for the dignity of man.

Only a generation ago, Africa generally was regarded as the "dark continent," a land presumably populated by

unambitious, benighted individuals, an area to be exploited and governed by absentee landlords, a treasure house of raw materials upon which the so-called civilized world might draw at its whim.

As events and pressures have intensified concern for the well-being of others, the irresistible forces which brought into being the United States of America have been nourished and nurtured by our Nation. Consequently, we can regard with gratification and satisfaction the trends which have enabled other peoples to embark on the course charted at Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, 189 years ago.

That movement has given birth to nearly 3 dozen self-governing republics and voluntary commonwealths, established in a brief span of time on the continent of Africa. The most recent celebration of its own independence day occurred in Tunisia, on June 1. In commemorating the recognition of their own sovereignty, nearly 4 million citizens of that former French territory reaffirmed—in a manner which justifies faith in their capability and courage—their dedication to the ideals of respect for individuals, of opportunity to choose one's own way of life, and of collective cooperation for mutual advancement and betterment.

It is a privilege to note the observance of Tunisia's Independence Day, and, in passing, to remark that in the months ahead, during the current year, some 20-odd other African countries will enjoy the same rewarding emotions, which also have been felt earlier this year in another 8 free African nations. No longer is this great, rich continent to be regarded as backward and unaspiring. We trust that the promise of a rewarding future will be realized by each one.

INTERVENTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, although President Johnson's intervention into the Dominican Republic was misunderstood and misinterpreted by certain members of the American press corps, and by the editors of several influential papers, it has been encouraging to me to note just how much support and understanding one finds for the President's policy from a broad reading of the American press.

As an indication of the breadth of this support, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD five recent items:

First. An article in the Washington Star for June 1, 1965, by the veteran liberal columnist, Eric Sevareid.

Second. An article by the well-known Hearst columnist, Pierre J. Huss, in the New York Journal American for May 16, 1965.

Third. An article by Ray Cromley, veteran columnist for the Scripps-Howard press, in the Washington Daily News for May 12, 1965.

Fourth. An editorial which appeared on May 4, 1965, in the Bridgeport, Conn., Post.

Fifth. An article in the Washington Star for May 31, 1965, by the well-known Washington columnist, Max Freedman.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues, in particular, to a few paragraphs from Mr. Sevareid's column, which I consider all the more significant because Mr. Sevareid has, over the years, been regarded as a member of the liberal community—as a champion of moderation and a foe of extremism.

For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth—

Said Mr. Sevareid—

impossible to believe that a democratic and stable government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful blood-letting in the congested downtown region.

Meantime the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary while communism is permanent.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,
June 1, 1965]

SOME ANSWERS TO SECOND-GUESSERS

(By Eric Sevareid)

The tide of second guessing about the American intervention in Santo Domingo—as to its justification, its size, its methods and its aims—had reached oceanic proportions by the time this writer managed to get to the first European city established in the New World. Here in what Columbus called "the land of God," had come the first teachers and preachers, yet here remains, after 5 centuries, one of the political hellholes of the hemisphere, its soiled streets once again thronged with armed men from abroad.

The scenes of bitter sorrow in Santo Domingo have been well described; there are other things, perhaps, worth putting down at this late date. I thought I had rarely seen such brave work by combat reporters, rarely such emotional involvement on the part of some of them, rarely such a wealth of unconfirmable reports and rumors, rarely such a disastrous lack of contact between reports and American officials who were not only physically remote but for a long time silenced by Presidential orders. And rarely have I read such certain conclusions in American press editorials about a phenomenon in which so much was uncertain and inconclusive.

For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth, impossible to believe that a democratic and stable government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful bloodletting in the congested downtown region.

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor and a safety sector with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste.

June 3, 1965

Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "too late with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "too soon with too much." I fail to understand the editorialist who points out with disdain that after all, there were only a few handfuls of Communists present.

In a very real sense their lack of numbers is their strength. It was because they were few that President Bosch had not bothered to deal severely with them. It was because they were few that they could do much of their work undetected. It was because they were few that they could act with rapidity when the explosion came. It was because they were few that foreign opinionmakers could make the Americans seem ridiculous and give us a propaganda defeat. As John Bartlow Martin reminds us, Communists do not make revolutions, they take them over.

Partly because of this—their small numbers—American troops could not invade the heart of the city, or allow anyone else to invade it.

You cannot risk causing many deaths in order to capture a few individuals and expect, ever, to justify such an action to anybody, certainly not to the American people. So, at this writing at least, the Dominican Communists remain, finding safety as they first found strength, in their numbers—their small numbers.

And their small number in various other Latin American countries lies near the heart of the profound dilemma that confronts the United States for the future. Revolts are brewing in other nations to the south. In all these revolts Communist elements will be present. Are we to put down every uprising because a Communist threat is present? Obviously we cannot, even though some of these uprisings probably will produce Communist governments. This is why Castro laughs in his beard. He believes the political metamorphosis of Latin America is not manageable on our terms.

But nothing in this realm of human action is inevitable; the game is not lost as long as we act on the assumption that it can be won. There are Latin societies strong enough to handle the Communists on their own. Others will be galvanized into counteraction by Communist victories or near victories close by their borders.

Meantime the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary while communism is permanent.

It is nonsense to indulge any longer the self-conscious idea that Latin America's troubles are the fault of the United States. Some are; most are the fault of Latin America. Its ways of life are superior to ours in more than a few respects, but not in respect to the art of government. In the last century and a half there have been in all of Latin America approximately 3,700 coups, rebellions, and civil wars.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, May 16, 1965]

WORLD IN FOCUS: INTERVENTION VERSUS AGGRESSION

(By Pierre J. Huxs)

The Soviet Union, Red China, and Communist Cuba never tire of branding U.S. military intervention in South Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic as "naked aggression." We are so accustomed to hearing this propaganda smear that we shrug it off. But

the Reds know from the big lie technique that the oftener you tell a whopper the more will unconsciously sink into the minds of those you target as your next victim.

To set the record straight, then, what is intervention and aggression—especially if you put it in the light of the large-scale landing of U.S. Marines in the Dominican Republic? I asked one of the foremost experts in U.N. to answer that question, Ambassador Liu Chieh of Nationalist China.

I turn this column over to Ambassador Chieh:

"Intervention and aggression are not necessarily synonymous or interchangeable words. In recent world history most flagrant acts of aggression have been committed without involving overt and direct acts of intervention. In our day this type of concealed, indirect but carefully calculated aggression—usually carried out through the familiar tactics of infiltration, subversion and the use of proxies—has been developed by the Communists into a fine art. Indeed, it has become the most favored, as well as the most effective tool of Communist foreign policy."

Ambassador Chieh added:

"Yet this type of aggression has received no careful consideration in the textbooks of international law. One of the basic tenets of international law is the concept of direct responsibility of states for their international conduct. In the Communist strategy of protracted conflict, direct action is more often than not avoided."

"This being so, it is often difficult to fasten on the Communist governments the precise legal blame, even when they have in fact committed legal aggression."

"The Communist governments do not set great store by bourgeois international law. Yet they do not hesitate to turn traditional judicial concepts to their own advantage. Now the U.S. action in the Dominican Republic was admittedly an act of intervention. The U.S. Government never concealed this fact. This intervention, far from being an aggression, was intended to accomplish the dual purpose of protecting American lives and forestalling the Communist takeover of a sister republic. So the U.S. action was in fact but a response to Communist intervention and aggression."

Ambassador Chieh emphasized that if a sovereign people in a helpless country are threatened by the Red foe, their right must be upheld to pick a government that is the choice of the popular majority.

"It should be remembered," he said, "that the right of self-determination can be properly exercised only in unfettered freedom."

"In the case of the Dominican Republic, there was ample evidence that Communist conspirators attempted to exploit the chaos and confusion that initially broke out in Santo Domingo. It would have been a mockery of the principle of self-determination if the Dominican people had been left at the mercy of these Communist adventurers."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, May 12, 1965]

U.S. DOMINICAN ACTION IS BOOST FOR VIETNAMESE

(By Ray Cromley)

President Johnson's quick, strong action in the Dominican Republic may have a major effect on morale in Vietnam.

A Vietnamese guerrilla fighter now in town says privately that "the U.S. Dominican stand is more significant to him than American raids in North Vietnam."

The northern raids have boosted South Vietnamese confidence markedly. But there has still been the nagging fear these bombings may be part of a U.S. buildup in preparation for negotiations. There's a strong belief in South Vietnam that negotiations mean defeat.

SOMETHING ELSE

Moving U.S. troops into the Dominican Republic, without shilly shallying, to stop a Red thrust in that tiny country, is something else again.

It means to this guerrilla fighter and to other Vietnamese he is in contact with, that President Johnson really means to stop communism.

Since Laos, they don't believe promises or speeches.

But if Mr. Johnson is willing to stake U.S. prestige in the tiny Dominican Republic, then it's not likely, they reason, the President could afford to let Vietnam go down the drain.

By the same token, this Dominican action may be discouraging to Hanoi.

The nagging fear among South Vietnamese officials, military men, hamlet chiefs, police, and everyone else who has stuck his neck and his family's neck out in fighting the Communists, has been that the United States would pull out despite President Johnson's assurances to the contrary.

BIG QUESTION

The one question almost every Vietnamese I saw asked me on my trip through South Vietnam was, "Will the United States stay if the war is long and discouraging?"

These men knew a pullout would mean death for themselves and their families at the hands of Communists.

This worry about what the United States would do has not engendered courage. In some cases, it has meant that local officials hedged their bets and kept tightly to neutrality, straying neither to the Communist or Government sides.

The feeling that the United States would leave accounts in sizable measure for Cambodia's Red China leanings, for Burma's careful leftist "neutrality," and for the cautiousness of millions of uncommitted people in southeast Asia.

EXPERIENCE

Experience in the mainland China and other Asian wars suggests that when the people are certain which side will win a war, they leap to that side in large numbers.

Because of the Korean, mainland China, and Lao wars, there's a strong feeling in Asia that the United States is good at "quickie" fights, but that it wearsies in long struggles. This feeling accounts for the belief in many Asian minds that in the long run the Reds will win.

The trickle of information from South Vietnam the past few days seems to indicate the Dominican action will help convince some doubters that the war is not in the Communist bag.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, May 4, 1965]

AN ERROR RECTIFIED

It is now clear that the United States originally underestimated the role of communists in the Dominican Republic. But when the error was discovered, it acted swiftly with armed forces.

That simplified analysis was made in informed diplomatic circles in Washington over the weekend following the turbulent week of rioting and shooting in Santo Domingo.

The United States sent nearly 5,000 marines and airborne troops into the island, solely to rescue American and other foreign citizens whose lives were endangered by the rising anarchy. President Johnson announced that 4,500 additional marines and paratroops were being sent to the Republic.

Some critics had been arguing that our military operation was larger than necessary, and was primarily intended to halt a rebellion which threatened to open the way to Communist domination of the little nation.

June 3, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12071

Actually, President Johnson's moves appear to have been based on both considerations. In his announcement that more troops were to be sent to Santo Domingo, President Johnson said their presence was necessary to secure the island against communism, as the Red uprising had been taken over by Communist conspirators directed from abroad.

This would seem clearly to mean that Castro and his deadly crews are behind the anarchy in the Dominican Republic. Law and order broke down completely when rebellious army leaders who started the uprising acknowledged they could not control the elements they had set loose. Those elements were under control of hardcore Communist trained in Cuba and Czechoslovakia, and they began deliberate moves to attack U.S. nationals and property.

By last midweek more than 50 Communists had been identified, actively engaged in arming and leading toughs and criminals in an effort to set up a second Communist bastion in this hemisphere.

President Johnson moved quickly, despite the knowledge that many Latin Americans and Europeans would be infuriated by "unilateral" Yankee action reminiscent of gunboat diplomacy. The President took the action because he felt that at the moment there was no other course. It was certainly better to bruise Latin sensibilities than risk the deaths of U.S. citizens, and a continued trend to anarchy which would eventually make another Cuba out of the Dominican Republic.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram, May 5, 1965]

THE JOHNSON DOCTRINE

President Johnson is bolstering the Monroe Doctrine and bringing it up to date. It will be remembered that for more than 100 years, the Monroe Doctrine kept this hemisphere from further colonization by European powers by warning that any attempt at a power grab by a foreign country on this hemisphere would be opposed by the United States.

The Monroe Doctrine had its most crucial test in 1867 in Mexico. Austrian Archduke Maximilian I established a kingdom there in 1864. Pressure from the United States forced France to withdraw its armed support. President Lincoln was occupied in the Civil War but lent his influence to Mexican patriots against the monarchy. Patriots led by Benito Juarez defeated Maximilian and he was executed.

Theodore Roosevelt enforced the Monroe Doctrine against Kaiser Wilhelm's Germany at the turn of the century. In the Venezuela claims dispute, he advanced the theory, which became known as the Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine, that the United States had direct interest and the obligation to impose order in the affairs of Latin American countries. That turned back German warships that had been dispatched to collect German claims. Latin America did not like it but the Roosevelt corollary maintained order in the hemisphere for a third of a century.

Now President Johnson has imposed his own corollary to the ancient Monroe Doctrine. That is, that when foreign elements including citizens of other Latin American countries, intervene in the affairs of another such country, the United States will oppose them. It is because Communist-trained rebels, including some Cuban and Czechoslovakia trainees, infiltrated the rebellion and took control, that American marines joined the counterrebellion.

The marines had been sent to evacuate American and other nationals and did. In the meantime, a cease-fire was violated be-

cause the rebels had lost control of their forces. The rebels had been infiltrated by Castro and the Soviet Union. They could not secure the cease-fire to which they had agreed.

Former President Eisenhower approved Mr. Johnson's action. Had Mr. Eisenhower moved as quickly in Cuba, Fidel Castro might not have had a chance to consolidate the first Communist foothold on the hemisphere. President Johnson is acting to prevent a second foothold. Of course he was immediately branded an Imperialist by Castro and the Soviet Union. They could not stand being frustrated in the second power grab.

[From the Evening Star, Washington (D.C.), May 31, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S DOMINICAN ACTION
(By Max Freedman)

It is best to admit that the sending of U.S. marines into the Dominican Republic, without the prior consent of the Organization of American States, constituted a technical breach of the charter under which this American system of regional security operates. No amount of retrospective logic can wipe out that fact. The serious questions are whether President Johnson and Secretary Rusk had any valid alternative; and whether their actions since the early days of the crisis have strengthened or weakened the inter-American system.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, for example, has recalled that President Kennedy was very careful to consult with OAS during the Cuban crisis of 1962. He speaks with special authority on that crisis for his own contribution in those critical days was consistently valiant and distinguished. Yet Senator KENNEDY, on reflection, will surely admit that his comparison, at bottom, is completely misleading.

The essential feature of the Cuban crisis is that President Kennedy, amid conditions of intense secrecy and in days filled with almost incredible activity, had a margin of precious time to prepare the American response down to the last detail. Included in that plan of action was the wise decision to inform the OAS, the United Nations, and various leaders of the Western World.

But this statement of America's intentions, whether conveyed privately or publicly, came very late in the day. It came only after the carefully considered American plan had been set in motion. At no time was President Kennedy prepared to give the inter-American system the right to modify his plan, to delay it, or to veto it. In no sense of the term as understood by diplomacy was there any "consultation" with the OAS. President Kennedy merely informed it of his plans when it became both wise and convenient for him to do so.

Now it would be absurd to compare the Dominican crisis with the Cuban crisis as a threat to peace. But the inherent danger of the present crisis is not now the issue. What concerns us is the fact that the special circumstances of the Dominican crisis gave President Johnson less time for working with the OAS than President Kennedy had in the Cuban emergency. Those circumstances included the breakdown of law and order, the sinister threat of Communist mischief in conditions of spreading anarchy, the urgent and repeated confessions by the Dominican authorities then in power that they had lost control of the situation, and the reluctant but unanimous judgment of U.S. officials in Santo Domingo that troops had to be sent at once by Washington to protect and evacuate American citizens.

It was the unanimous decision of everyone who participated in Johnson's decision that

the crisis would tolerate no delay. There was the related agreement that the OAS, even in the best of circumstances, could take no action in less than 48 hours; and the warning messages from Santo Domingo emphasized that such a delay would entail an intolerable risk to American lives.

Was this an unreasonable estimate of the situation when one remembers the history of the OAS in other emergencies and its conduct in this crisis? There will be many Americans, as well as many people in Latin America, who will be ready to believe that we are able to indulge these academic anxieties only because the President's decision did in fact avert disaster. For it would be a very different debate if we were conducting it on the ruins of freedom in the Dominican Republic, if another Castro-influenced government were in power there, and if the contagion of anarchy and communism spread to other lands in Latin America.

The record shows that President Johnson, perhaps more than any other President in our history, has been eager to strengthen the inter-American system and to equip it with the power to act quickly and decisively in meeting any threat to the security of this hemisphere. If he succeeds in this enterprise, it may well be the judgment of future historians that a small technical breach, soon rectified, led to the most significant gains in regional consultation and security. It is President Johnson's long-term commitment to the OAS that matters, and it is high time that commitment were more closely understood, both here and in Latin America.

SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAGNA
CARTA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the 750th anniversary of the granting of the Magna Carta is at hand; and I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a proclamation on the subject by the mayor of Dallas, along with a statement on the great charter, prepared most ably by Mrs. Harry Joseph Morris, State chairman of the Texas State Magna Carta Committee.

There being no objection, the proclamation and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
City of Dallas.

PROCLAMATION

This year, 1965, is the 750th anniversary of the granting of the great charter known as Magna Carta; and

Whereas Magna Carta provided the cornerstone of constitutional free government and some of the basic political ideas which shaped our Nation's Declaration of Independence and Constitution; and

Whereas in Magna Carta are embedded the concepts of government limited by law, of individual liberties, of right of trial by jury, of just taxation subject to approval by a competent assembly, and other fundamental principles of freedom and justice; and

Whereas to commemorate the 750th anniversary of the granting of Magna Carta, special ceremonies will be held at Runnymede, England, site at which King John and 2,000 English barons fashioned Magna Carta: Now, therefore,

I, Erik Jonsson, mayor of the city of Dallas, do hereby proclaim June 13-19, 1965, as Magna Carta Week.

ERIK JONSSON,
Mayor of the City of Dallas.

12072

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 3, 1965

THE 750TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAGNA CARTA

(By Mrs. Harry Joseph Morris, charter, honorary life State regent of the Texas division of the National Society Magna Carta Dames; State chairman, the Texas State Magna Carta Committee; and official representative of the State of Texas, appointed by Gov. John Connally; and official representative of the city of Dallas, appointed by Mayor Erik Jonsson, of Dallas, to the 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta, at Runnymede)

King John of England granted the great charter, the Magna Carta, at a certain meadow between Staines and Windsor, near Egham, known as Runnymede on Monday, the 15th of June, 1215 A.D.

In preparation for his parley with the barons of England, he had made his headquarters at Windsor Castle. The insurgents were in possession of the city of London. The barons' armed host crossed the Thames by Staines bridge and set up their pavilions on Runnymede. John came there to meet them, with a small retinue of bishops and magnates whose names can be read in the preamble to the charter. His advisers included Stephen Langton, cardinal and archbishop of Canterbury, and the Earl Marshal of England, Hubert de Burgh. The weight of their counsel coupled with the unrelenting pressure of the baronial leadership compelled John to cede the charter.

Modern historians point to the limited application of the charter, interpreting it as a feudal document intended to reform specific abuses of John's own reign. It is true that the barons in 1215 were often thinking in terms of their own order and that many generations later lawyers began to interpret the charter in the light of vastly changed circumstances. It is equally true that the Magna Carta proved in times of crisis to be the safeguard of constitutional progress and that the simple legal rulings embodied in the charter are the principles in which our courts take pride today, and has been the keystone for not only English law, but for the development of our own.

Quoting from Gov. John Connally, "In this age of space, when mankind is on the verge of explorations of other planets, it is well to pause for awhile and reflect on our priceless heritage of freedom. Without such a heritage, all we are and all we hope to be, would be meaningless, for liberty is our most priceless possession."

Further quoting from Gov. John Connally's official memorandum, dated February 9, 1965: "Magna Carta provided the cornerstone of constitutional free government and some of the basic political ideas which shaped our own Nation's Declaration of Independence and Constitution. In Magna Carta are embedded the concepts of government limited by law, of individual liberties, of right of trial by jury, of just taxation subject to approval by a competent assembly, and other fundamental principles of freedom and justice. * * * It is fitting that this 750th anniversary of the granting of the Magna Carta be observed by all citizens, and that the importance of Magna Carta to our form of government and our way of life be recognized. Therefore, I, as Governor of Texas, do hereby designate the week of June 13-19, 1965, as Magna Carta Week in Texas."

The surety barons, from whom the members of the Texas Division of the National Society Magna Carta Dames claim descent are: William d'Albini, Roger Bigod, Hugh Bigod, Henry de Bohun, Richard de Clare, Gilbert de Clare, John FitzRobert, Robert Fitzwalter, William de Huntingfield, John de Lacie, William de Lanvallel, William Malet, William de Mowbray, Saire de Quincey, Robert de Roos, Geoffrey de Saye, Robert de Vere. The names of the other surety barons who

have no known issue living today are: William de Fortibus, William de Hardell, Geoffrey de Mandeville, William Marshall, Roger de Montbegon, Richard de Montfichet, Richard de Percy, Eustace de Vescl.

The 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta will be celebrated in Britain in June 1965, and some 200 American descendants of the Magna Carta barons, headed by Mrs. John S. Wurts, Sr., national president of the National Society Magna Carta Dames, and her daughter, Miss Dorothy Wurts, national Magna Carta tour director, both of Philadelphia, Pa., with representatives from all of the 50 States will attend.

Mrs. Harry Joseph Morris, charter, honorary life State regent of the Texas division of the National Society Magna Carta Dames, 6840 Lakewood Boulevard, Dallas, who has been appointed by Gov. John Connally to be the official representative of the State of Texas, and who has also been appointed by Mayor Erik Jonsson to be the official representative of the city of Dallas, will head the Texas delegation who will attend the 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta ceremonies in England. The Texas delegation includes: Mrs. George Halfin Likins and Miss Florine Antoinette Tye, Abilene; Mr. Jameston Rezin Brannon, Jr., Carthage; Miss Nadine Lain, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Laird, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick M. Lange, Miss Grace Lockey, Mrs. John I. Moore, Mr. Richard James Price, Mrs. Verna Tye Price, and Mrs. Morris, all of Dallas; Mrs. D. L. Decker, Jr., Mrs. Robert E. Hulver, Mrs. E. Bates Nisbet, Houston; Mrs. Robert J. Whelan and Miss Regina Whelan, Marshall; Mrs. William E. Bates, Midland; Mrs. Ervin A. Tyroff, San Antonio; Mrs. F. Knight Parker, San Augustine; Mrs. L. E. Livingston, Jr., Seabrook; Mrs. Paul G. Gooch, Victoria; Mrs. Robert Knox Egan, Mr. and Mrs. John Hart Wilson, Wichita Falls; and they will be headquartered at the Europa Hotel in London, England, from June 6 through 16, and will enjoy many interesting tours through the historic sites of England.

Among the events scheduled are: On Monday, June 7, the Magna Carta tour group will be honor guests at the full dress rehearsal of the Magna Carta play, written by John Arden, one of Britain's most praised young playwrights, who was commissioned to write a play commemorating the 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta, by the city of London, which will be premiered at the Mermald Theater, the only theater in the ancient city of London, in a riverside setting. On Thursday, June 10, the party will attend the Magna Carta ceremony at St. Paul's Cathedral in London, and her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, hopes to attend. On Saturday, June 12, they will see the lovely ceremony known as "Trooping the Color," celebrating the official birthday of the Queen, when a full dress parade of the Brigade of Guards is held by the Queen on Horse Guards Parade. The highlight of the trip will be at Runnymede on Tuesday, June 15, when a special ceremony presented by the Magna Carta Trust, England, to commemorate the historic sealing of the Great Charter by King John, in A.D. 1215, will be held. A ceremony will also be held in the Great Hall of the Law Courts on June 15, in London, at which the Lord Chancellor and the judges of the Supreme Court will be present, with representatives of the legal profession in Britain and distinguished representatives from the Commonwealth and the United States attending.

It is interesting to note that Runnymede is still a placid green meadow, uninterrupted except by a small memorial to the Magna Carta erected by the American Bar Association, and the new memorial to the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States of America, which was dedicated with an acre of ground, on May 14, 1965, by Her Majesty, the Queen, with Mrs. Jacqueline

Kennedy and her two children, Caroline and John, Jr., Kennedy, attending.

When the Magna Carta was granted on Runnymede in 1215, a number of copies were sealed and were taken with writs to the shires in the country. Four copies remain; one in Salisbury Cathedral (probably the one taken to Wiltshire), one in Lincoln Cathedral (probably the one taken to Lincolnshire), and two in the British Museum. There are three reissues of the Magna Carta, in 1216, in 1217, and in 1225. A copy of the latter, known as the Laycock Abbey reissue, is in the British Museum.

The Dallas-Fort Worth Colony of the Texas Division of the National Society of Magna Carta Dames, of which Mrs. James D. Luttrell, Sr., is the regent, presented a facsimile of the Magna Carta, which was sent to New York by England, for the World's Fair in 1939, with an honor guard of which John William MacGowan was captain. Mr. MacGowan presented the facsimile to the Dallas-Fort Worth Colony, who in turn presented it to the Dallas Public Library at a formal dedication on Monday, June 15, 1964, on the 749th anniversary of the Magna Carta, with Mrs. Luttrell, Sr., assisted by Mrs. Harry Joseph Morris, honorary life regent of the Dallas-Fort Worth Colony, and charter, honorary life State regent of the Texas Division of the National Society Magna Carta Dames, making the presentation to Mrs. Lillian Bradshaw, director-librarian of the Dallas Public Library, in her office. The facsimile includes both the Latin version and the English translation, and hangs as a permanent display in the Texas history and genealogy department of the Dallas Public Library.

Mayor Erik Jonsson has proclaimed June 13-19, 1965, as Magna Carta Week in Dallas, and other mayors in the various cities throughout the State are also issuing similar proclamations, in a statewide observance of the 750th anniversary of the Magna Carta.

"ELECTRONICS: THE ROOM-SIZE WORLD"

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in a few short weeks the performance of the communications satellite known as Early Bird has astonished peoples around the globe. Since the launching in April, this extraordinary vehicle has demonstrated to all mankind the remarkable achievements possible by talented, determined individuals laboring in a free society and motivated by a desire to put technological skill and scientific know-how into service for human benefit.

The Communications Satellite Corporation has, with this almost unbelievable dependable relay mechanism, taken a first step in making practicable a truly global means of communication. The effectiveness of America's approach to the linking of continents and nations justifies the confidence typified by the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. I trust that the initial successes are an answer to all who doubted the soundness of the policy embodied in that controverted legislation.

The success of Early Bird was due in large part to pioneering efforts of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; but great credit must be given to private enterprise, notably, two versatile corporations which carry on a large proportion of their activities in my home State of California—the Douglas Aircraft Co., which produced the launch